



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/654,618	09/04/2003	Young-Chan Kim	1293.1851	5000
21171	7590	06/12/2007		
STAAS & HALSEY LLP SUITE 700 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005			EXAMINER SHERMAN, STEPHEN G	
			ART UNIT 2629	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 06/12/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Advisory Action  
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

10/654,618

Applicant(s)

KIM ET AL.

Examiner

Stephen G. Sherman

Art Unit

2629

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 04 June 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

**AMENDMENTS**

3. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
(a) ☒ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  
Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) rejected: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

**AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE**

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER**

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.  
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_  
13. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

AMR A. AWAD  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

*Amr Ahmad Awad*

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The amendments to independent claims 47 and 48 to include the limitations "...to the digital input port when the DISPLAYING DEVICE DETERMINES THAT THE analog input port is not receiving a normal input signal" and "...to the analog input port when the DISPLAYING DEVICE DETERMINES THAT THE digital input port is not receiving a normal digital input signal" raise new issues by changing the scope of the claims that would require further consideration and/or search..

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: On page 11 of the applicant's response the applicant argues the rejection of claims 1, 6, 11, 25, 40 and 49. The applicant argues specifically on page 14 that Takano does not discuss or suggest the use of a "physical" signal checking unit that checks the abnormality of an identified input signal and that a user selecting either a "yes" icon or a "no" icon depending upon whether window 505 displays the appropriate analog signal is not a "physical" signal checking unit which is part of a display device and concludes that "the signal checking unit" cited by the examiner in this case is a user, which cannot be considered to be a unit of a display device. The examiner respectfully disagrees. The examiner did not state that the user is the claimed "signal checking unit", the examiner said that the interface 235 which allows the user to select is the "signal checking unit" and the interface 235 IS physical. The claim also does not say what the "signal checking unit" is, but rather merely that there is a signal checking unit that checks whether an input signal is abnormal. The claim does not preclude that the checking aspect is done by a user. The claim only requires to have a unit that will check the abnormality of the signal. Since the interface is pressed by a user to indicate the abnormality then the interface, in the broadest reasonable interpretation of the claim, is a "signal checking unit". The applicant then argues on page 14, line 16 that Takano does not discuss or suggest a signal changing unit that switches from the checked input signal to a next checked input signal to be checked based on set data corresponding to the identified type of the input signal. The applicant tries to state that the limitation of claim 4 discusses that the set data is one of a number of times the identified input signal is checked and that thus claim 1 uses the set data of the number of times, the time required to check, and/or the position of the input signal to switch the checked input signal to a next input signal to be checked...The examiner respectfully disagrees. Claim 1 does NOT contain the limitations of claim 4. If the applicant wishes for the limitations of claim 4 to be read into claim 1 then claim 4 should be cancelled and the limitations added to independent claim 1. Claim 1 ONLY states "based on set data corresponding to the identified type of the input signal". The claim DOES NOT define what "set data" is nor does the claim recite what is meant by "identified type", therefore, the claim is open to be read in it's broadest reasonable interpretation as to these limitations. The examiner interpreted "based on set data corresponding to the identified type of input signal" to mean that since the video selection circuit 230 switches the input based upon the determination by the user, that this selection is done based upon whether the user determined the signal to be normal/abnormal. This means that the user selection is based upon what signal is presented, which means that the selection circuit switches dependent upon the signal presented and the so called "set data" is merely the "yes" or "no" provided by the user that determines the switching, and thus the inputs are switched based upon set data that corresponds to the type of signal provided. The applicant argues on page 15 of the response that independent claims 11 and 25 recite the limitation that the signal continues being displayed by the display device if the signal is normal and that Takano does not teach this because Takano only teaches that if the user presses yes that the lookup table 312 is filled and that the signal is not continued to be displayed, however, the examiner understands that when the user recognizes that the signal is "normal" that the signal changing unit does not change to a different signal, and therefore the input that is already selected will still be displayed on the screen after the selection. The claim does not require a limitation as to how long the signal is displayed only that the signal continues. The examiner understands this to mean that even if the video signal is displayed for a second after the determination that this constitutes as the claimed "continuing". If the applicant meant that the signal continues to be displayed until some point in time when an abnormal signal is detected, etc. then the limitation should be added to the claim. The examiner understands that the applicant's INVENTION does not require a user and that the switching is done automatically based upon the signal, and that there are substantial differences between the applicant's INVENTION and the invention of Takano, however, the CLAIM LANGUAGE is broad and does not reflect these differences when read in their broadest reasonable interpretation.